

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume II, No. 15

September 21, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Churches and the War

THE attitude of the Churches toward the war has now become a matter of public controversy. The actions of Church councils during the summer and the impact of the preaching of a large and influential section of the Protestant clergy have given rise to the charge that the Churches have assumed a position of aloofness from humanity's struggle.

The Churches are right in recognizing that there is a conflict for the Christian conscience in all war. But so far most of their pronouncements have not made clear that in this war the conflict is within the Christian conscience itself and not between a man as a Christian and a man as a citizen, or between the Church and the State. In other words, there are grounds for supporting the war and for believing in the necessity of victory for the United Nations which should make a stronger appeal to the sensitive Christian than to the conventional patriot. This journal has often stated these grounds. The chief of them are a concern for the possibility of justice for all peoples and a sense of solidarity with the victims of totalitarian tyranny and aggression. These are, to be sure, not exclusively Christian grounds. All that we maintain is that Christians should be especially sensitive to them. What we protest against above all else is the attempt of some leaders of the Church to discover for themselves, as Christians, a lofty position of neutrality in the struggle and to protect themselves in this by cultivating callousness to what is happening to people around the world and blindness to the dynamic character of the power that has enslaved them.

It is a mistake to suggest that the existence of the Christian Church or the survival of the Christian faith depend upon the outcome of the war. It is not amiss, however, to point out that the freedom of the Christian Church in many nations and the possibility of its reaching the souls of scores of millions of people—especially the younger generation—do depend upon the outcome of the war. There is a danger to the Church in having its freedom depend

upon a military victory; let that be said but let not the other things be left unsaid because they are inescapable facts.

The most poignant aspect of the position that has been taken by a large part of the leadership of the American Churches and which the silence of the councils of the Churches seems to echo is that men must face the horror of killing and the fate of dying with the suggestion made to them that they are merely victims of a common tragedy or of God's judgment. It would make a vast difference to many of them if they could know that on what they do depends the possibility of justice and freedom for men everywhere. They need not be told that what they do will insure justice and freedom. They know better than that. But to suggest that they are caught in the same tragic necessity, with the same meaning in it and no more, that confronts men who are drafted by the German, Japanese and Italian governments is to withhold from them a true interpretation of their situation and to deprive them and their families of a source of strength and morale which is rightfully theirs.

"Let the Church be the Church" has been a slogan that has led many Christian leaders to seek a position that transcends the partisanship and conflicts of this world, but in applying it they have in fact by their words and their silence come down on the side of a particular partisan position—the interpretation of the world's political situation—which has been held by a particular school of pacifists which has flourished chiefly in the United States. Some of them advocate an early negotiated peace without realizing that such a peace, prior to the defeat of the German power, surely would mean the betrayal of the conquered nations or Russia. That same slogan means something quite different to the Churches in Britain and even more to the Churches in such countries as Norway and Holland where the effort of the Church to preserve its own freedom has been the spearhead of national resistance.

The Church in order to remain the Church should

not by its silence give the impression that there are no momentous issues for the Christian conscience at stake in this war. It can state those issues clearly and broaden and deepen the resolve of Christian people in America to win the war and it can at the same time affirm the Christian duty to overcome hatred and vengeance, the Christian belief in the unity of the World Church, the Christian concern for freedom of conscience, the Christian imperative that calls us to work now for the basis for a just peace. Perhaps the test of it all is this: the Church can stress the need of repentance for the common sin that underlies this war; it can be specific in

showing how much the democratic nations share responsibility for the conditions which gave rise to the madness of the Axis powers, but it can do this without obscuring the fact that, however much we may all share the guilt for these things, it is still true that Germany and Japan represent an objective evil that we must defeat. It is as great an error to use our repentance as a means of hiding from ourselves the devastating character of the objective evil to which we are opposed as it is to suggest that this is a struggle between righteous and unrighteous nations.

J. C. B.

Protestantism's Divided Mind

JUSTIN WROE NIXON

THE leaders of the Protestant Churches in this country are divided over the moral support of the war. This fact has been known for some time to those active in inter-denominational affairs. It became evident to the nation at large in the early summer through the debate on the resolutions concerning the war, which were introduced at the meetings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., the Northern Baptist Convention, and the General Council of the Congregational-Christian Churches. The discussions at these meetings received nation-wide publicity, and the telegram of the President to the Baptists and his letter to the Congregationalists contained indications of his concern over the situation.

Usually the leaders of the larger Protestant bodies have been more sensitive to the moral aspects of public problems than have the masses of our people. But now these leaders are apparently more divided than the people themselves concerning the values at stake in the war. How is this division of sentiment to be accounted for? What does it portend for the future? What follows in the attempt of one individual to answer these questions for himself in the hope that his effort will stimulate others to seek their own answers?

Immediate Causes

The confusion and division of sentiment to which we have referred is due to three immediate causes.

First, there is the influence upon the mind of the churches of the Ecumenical Movement. Since the

last great war, this Movement, through its world conferences, has created a consciousness of "the Church" as a supra-national body which cannot represent primarily the interest of any one people, but of humanity as a whole as seen under the eye of God. This consciousness makes it impossible today to press any church that is "ecumenically-minded" into a purely nationalistic mold. What it says concerning the issues of the war must be said in the presence of Christians of other nations, such as Niemoeller and Kagawa, and such utterances must be brought under the criticism of universal moral standards that would safeguard the true interests of all peoples engaged in the war.

The fact that the Ecumenical Movement has made the churches sensitive to these universal standards is an inestimable gain. But it is now clear that this Movement has also brought perils. For, the churches of the various lands have obligations to their respective peoples for the enlightenment of their consciences concerning issues of public life. And the ecumenical idea has made it possible for the churches to retreat from the terrible valley of decision to the mount of supra-almost-everything that may be controversial. They can then justify their refusal to take a stand by the ecumenical slogan "Let the Church be the Church". As a result we have the strange spectacle of churches becoming quite articulate concerning the sale of liquor to soldiers, but remaining almost dumb concerning the cause for which the soldiers die. How can the people help but ask, "What scale of values do such churches possess?"

In the end the problem of reaching an understanding with German and Japanese churches, which have done their best to guide their peoples through the vicissitudes of this war, will be less than that of making something worthy out of the fellowship of churches that have chosen simply to live above the battle. The leaders of the Ecumenical Movement see this very clearly and they themselves have never used the ecumenical appeal to persuade churches to disown their responsibilities in public affairs.

Another cause of the confusion and division in the sentiment of Protestant leaders is the crusade against war. The crusade is an old American institution—with its good points but also with its weaknesses. It produces excellent speeches and arouses interest, but in the end it often defeats itself by over-simplifying the issues with which it deals.

The crusade in the churches against war has done just this. It has placed upon the records of many denominations resolutions to the effect that the churches will not bless war. These resolutions have been so interpreted that in the night of war all those who participate in armed conflict become equally black. In the actual event we discover there is something wrong here. We cannot avoid distinguishing between aggressors and their victims. We cannot just throw John Steinbeck's Norwegians in with his Nazis. A truck driver seeing the play or reading the book cannot. Neither can the rest of us. In our heart of hearts we know that it makes an immense difference how such a war comes out.

The distinctions we have to make in such a case do not mean that we have to bless war, any more than the distinctions between the moral levels on which business operates means that we have to bless capitalism. There are religious bodies which have condemned the "profit system" with a vigor only less than that with which they have condemned war. Does this mean that they cannot distinguish between a business carried on with some regard for social values and another that is little more than legalized robbery? Failure to make such a distinction would itself put a premium on crime.

This is exactly what we do when we refuse to make similar distinctions in respect to the issues involved in a war. Most of us hate the war-systems as some of us hate various aspects of the system of capitalism. We would put all coercion of the peoples under international control, as we would put all profits under the control of the public interest. But until better systems are set up in both the international and economic realms, we cannot fail to use our moral judgment in distinguishing the better from the worse in the systems under which we are still compelled to live.

The churches are discovering that the ancient evil of war cannot be leveled by blasts from the ecclesi-

astical ram's horn. This means that they themselves have to change over from the spirit of a crusade to that of siege operations. Until this change is made, confusion is likely to be evident in their deliverances.

The third factor in the situation we have been describing is the influence of the Pacifist Movement. This Movement in the larger Protestant denominations recruits its adherents mainly from the clergy, and particularly from the clergy who have had a liberal training. Just why conservative clergy do not respond to the pacifist appeal as readily as do the liberals is an interesting question. The answer to it would involve a critique of American education during the last generation, and more space than it can be given here.

In the denominational gatherings previously referred to, pacifist clergy led the opposition to statements which sought to clarify the values at stake in the war. They were far from being a majority in any gathering, but they used the ecumenical slogans and invoked the temper of the crusade in such a way as to divide the counsel of church bodies whose long-time tradition is not pacifist. That they were able to do so is a tribute to their influence.

Can the Churches Speak Only of Peace?

What does this division in counsel portend? Will the leaders of the great Protestant bodies come to more of an agreement as to the values at stake in the war and be able to express their understanding of those values to the country? Or will they try to "by-pass" the war and avoid controversy by speaking only of the peace? If the war is short, it may not make much difference what they do. But if the war is long and our losses are grievous, our people are likely to seek a plain-spoken interpretation of their ordeal from those to whom they have been accustomed to look for moral leadership.

The Protestant Churches, moreover, have a peculiar responsibility for furnishing such leadership. Their clergy were active in the movement which resulted in the founding of the American Republic and they sustained the morale of the people through the long struggle of the Revolution. From that time until now, these churches have borne their witness to the conscience of the nation concerning the issues before it, even when that witness meant a division in the churches themselves, as in the case of slavery. If in the face of this war they should resign such a responsibility, the consequences would not be good either for Protestantism or the American State.

The consequences would not be good for Protestantism because the laity of these larger denominations are not pacifists and they are not going to "by-pass" the war. The evidence that these laymen

are not pacifists in a religious sense is overwhelming. The kind of pacifism described by Raoul de Sales in *The Making of Tomorrow*—“ . . . such a sense of the folly, misery and outmoded character of war that one can hardly bring oneself to believe in its reality . . . ”—is of course widespread in the churches as in all the western countries. But confronted with the actual ordeal of war, these Protestant laymen do not react as pacifists.

One of the revelations of the draft has been its disclosure of the slight amount of religious pacifism that exists among the laity of the larger churches. The Methodists, for instance, (according to the Federal Council's figures as of March 1, 1942), report hardly any more conscientious objectors than do the Quakers (339 to 297). Yet the membership of the Methodist Church is seventy times that of the various Quaker meetings. The figures for the larger Protestant bodies show no greater proportion of conscientious objectors than do the Methodists.

On the basis of returns available from the denominations, the government's figures for New York City do not seem so incredible as they first appeared. On April 10, 1942, Colonel Arthur V. McDermott of Selective Service reported that of 1,619,304 registrants for the draft in the City only 136 had qualified as conscientious objectors. That is less than one “C. O.” to 10,000 registrants. Suppose the larger Protestant bodies reported ten times this proportion, or one “C. O.” to 1,000 registrants, the number of their conscientious objectors would still be negligible. There is nothing in our experience to contradict the admission of C. J. Cadoux, leading British pacifist, that the people with his point of view represent but “a tiny fraction” of the constituents of the modern state.

The laymen of our larger Protestant bodies, accordingly, are in the war and they will continue to bear its burdens and endure its perils until the end. Is it conceivable that the leaders of Protestantism can ignore the claim of these laymen for an adequate interpretation of the values at stake in their struggle? It was the possibility that this claim might be ignored that apparently inspired Mr. Charles P. Taft, distinguished Christian layman, to say a few months ago: “The practical man and the statesman are faced with choices between alternatives, none of which are entirely satisfactory. They need a Christian philosophy which can help them solve their problem. Are the Christian Churches going to throw us out and leave us nothing but stoicism? . . . I am worrying about the Christian Churches when they don't provide a philosophy for men of action.”

The Protestant Churches should accept Mr. Taft's challenge. If they do not, they will compel their

laymen to look elsewhere for moral guidance in this crisis. This will not be good for Protestantism.

Nor will the consequences of this turning away of the laymen from the churches for the interpretation of their struggle be good for the State. In this country, Church and State are separated, but this does not mean that the State can carry on its work without the cooperation of religious bodies. In a country without an established Church, the State needs the sympathetic criticism and the voluntary support of free churches. It needs their criticism that the universal standards of truth and justice of which the churches speak may save the State from self-righteousness, and death through pride. It needs their support that the laymen of the churches, who so largely administer the affairs of the State, may feel that they do so with the approval of their spiritual guides and the blessing of God.

Take away the sanction of religion from the State and from its responsibility for maintaining an order in which worthy human life can flourish, and we invite the paganization of the State, the development of a nationalistic religion with the State as its object of devotion.

It would be a paradox of history if the American Protestant Churches, the freest in the world, finding the sphere of State morality somewhat difficult, should turn it over to a nationalistic religion, which they had hitherto regarded as their most dangerous foe.

Necessity of Assurance

The task of the larger Protestant Churches in the interpretation of the war seems, accordingly, both formidable and unmistakable. They should not bless the war system, but condemn it. But now that war has come they should help their people to see the values at stake in this struggle. Among these values are the survival of this country as a free people; the freeing of other peoples from enslavement, threatened or actual; and the establishment, upon the consent of free peoples, of the foundations of world government.

The churches should set these values in the largest perspective of divine purpose available to our mortal vision. They should assure their people that no part of God has gone away on a journey, that the Justice, the Creativity and the Love of God are all at work in the world and available for our need. It is ours to see the work of God where we can, and trust Him where we cannot.

With these values at stake in the war, the churches must integrate the grave duties of their laymen, who have to save the world from being completely rav-

aged first by tyranny and then by revenge. Resolutely the churches must face the grave choices before their laymen, and then help them to make those choices as under the eye of God. Meanwhile, the ecumenical vision in the churches must grow not more dim, but more clear, and the purpose to abolish

the curse of war must become both more determined and more intelligent.

The task indeed is formidable. But it is such a task as historic Protestantism has fulfilled in its great moments. It is difficult to believe that it will not fulfill it today.

Sons of God Go Forth to War

STANLEY HIGH

WHAT," asks a recent *Christian Century* editorial, "shall the Christian do?" *The Christian Century's* answer was lost in what, for me, was an impenetrable thicket of theology. But the question seems to be a good one: "What Shall the Christian Do?"

A layman's answer to that question must begin and, I think, come near to ending with the fact of what multitudes of Christians are doing. Multitudes of them are engaged up to the hilt in winning the war. They are engaged on the military and civilian fronts at home and abroad. They are not only engaged in body and mind but in heart and spirit. The bare and frequently grim fact of their engagement is the most acute and inescapable of current religious realities. If the Christian ministry has life as its subject matter, then this fact, certainly, is the stuff for today's ministering. In the average pew, almost all of life is now conditioned and encompassed by it.

Now, the moral frame of mind in which multitudes of American Christians do what they are doing is, I think, important. It is important because it is bound to have an effect upon the outcome of the war, the nature of the peace and the status of religion in the post-war world.

I have done a good deal of recent travelling in the United States. Among other places, I have visited some fifteen army camps and naval stations. It may be that I have not known where to look or that I am inadequate at editorialized reporting. But neither on the civilian nor the military front have I discovered anything that, on any considerable scale, could go by the name of moral uncertainty.

I certainly found among these Christians very little of the religious dualism to which some Protestant churchmen now appear to be preparing themselves, by titanic theological wrestlings, to minister. On the whole, the dualism simply does not exist. The wrestling has probably already gone too far, too publicly to be diminished by that fact. But it reduces any ministry derived from it to approximate meaninglessness; fixes a gulf between minister and layman, and cuts down whatever claim the preacher has to speak authoritatively for the church.

"Necessary Christian Necessity"

Christians, as I have found them, are not engaged in this war—to use the formula of equivocation—as an "unnecessary necessity." They are engaged in it as a "necessary Christian necessity." That, of course, may only be the latest proof of the layman's congenital lack of spiritual insight. But if that is the case and spiritual insight is what is lacking, then one would certainly expect to observe the consequences of that shortage in other directions.

But it is a notable fact that they are not appearing. In fact, doing what the Christian now feels under Christian necessity to do has involved him in none of the dire consequences predicted by those who insist that he shall do something else or nothing. That is just another instance where the temporal pacifists—as distinguished from the religious pacifists—tilted at a man that turned out to be straw.

What, instead of spiritual deterioration, is appearing among these laymen is spiritual soundness which, while it lacks nothing in vision, has worldly quality about it that augurs well for Christian lay leadership after the war.

There has been, in the first instance, no engulfing of their Christian spirit by hate. The attitude I have most frequently met seems to have considerably less of the materials of hate in it than the spirit and fact-perverting declarations of those who, having forecast that hate was bound to ensue from war, are now out, at whatever moral cost, to prove that it is ensuing. If, in the war's decisive aftermath, the Christian panacea is given a hearing and a chance, it will almost certainly be under the leadership of those tried-by-fire Christians who fought without hating rather than at the hands of those who have it to their credit only that they did not hate.

Neither, I think, are these Christians unaware of the importance of that larger Christian fellowship which transcends battle lines and, in the obscurantist lingo of ecclesiasticism, goes by the name of Ecumenical. In fact, their conception of that fellowship—as I have heard it expressed—appears to adhere to an authentic idea of fellowship without running off

into something no better than a no-questions-asked inclusiveness.

If Christian fellowship now and after this war means anything, some questions have to be asked. They do not, happily, concern race or place of legal residence or denominational affiliation. But they certainly do concern commitments and convictions.

Not all of the ecclesiastically naturalized Christians in the countries at war want the kind of post-war world in which men have freedom to choose to be free and a guaranteed chance to work to win the material, intellectual and spiritual benefits of that freedom. Despite the blanket brotherliness which is now the vogue, I think it is altogether probable that only an exceedingly small minority of Christians in the countries we are at war with want that kind of world.

Undoubtedly, there will be many in that day who will arise and say "Lord, Lord." But unless Christianity, after the war, is to be no more than a sterile body from which no ameliorating worldly issue is expected, then those who do not want that kind of world cannot be called our spiritual kinsmen. By all that goes to make up the difference between incarnate good and evil, they are our enemies.

The most important community after this war will not be the community of those who, ecclesiastically, are Christian. It will be the community of those Christian and non-Christian who are like-minded. It is to be hoped that that community will include a disproportionately large number of Christians. But whether, technically, they are Christians or not is of less importance than that, ideologically, they desire to go in what, non-technically, we call the Christian way.

Meanwhile, it does not seem to me that the prospects for the earthly kingdom of our Lord are helped any by those who, in their great urge to get everybody in, propose to let down all the moral and spiritual bars and embrace friend and enemy—but particularly enemy—en masse and in toto. It is much more likely to be advanced by those Christians who will bear in their bodies the marks of this struggle and who will be dedicated to a fellowship that is exclusive, taking in those at home and abroad who want a free world and leaving out those who do not. I am inclined to believe that Russia's communist party will qualify more persons for membership in such a fellowship than the Christian Church in some countries of Europe and some Christian Churches in the United States.

Penitence in Prayers

Then, of course, there is the matter of penitence. Penitence appears, in some quarters to have been hit upon as the means by which to inject some show of sense and moral significance into the "Unnecessary Necessity." Prayers for use in wartime fairly reek

with it. Almost every church declaration on the war has it for a start and an ending. The sons of God are going forth to war. The church blesses their going—provided their banners are sackcloth.

In all the current effort to demonstrate that "the Church, as such, is not at war," no other minor truth has been so inflated to the status of a major distortion as this. And no other current preaching gets less lay response.

This does not mean that there is no awareness among those to whom the war is more than academic that the United States is considerably less than lily-white in the eyes of God. There is such an awareness. But it is a result of familiarity with recent world events and not, merely, the result of the necessity for an apologetic.

To say that, quantitatively or qualitatively, the guilt of the United States for this war belongs in the same category as that of the Axis nations is either naïve or dangerously dishonest. That there is some naïveté in it is, I think, apparent particularly when one recalls the case of the famous itinerant missionary-evangelist who apparently believes that he almost turned back the Japanese half-way to Pearl Harbor by the offer to cede Dutch Guiana to Japan.

But there is far more downright dishonesty. Every shortcoming of American foreign policy for the last twenty-five years, and particularly for the last ten years, is deliberately enlarged. The efforts of the United States through the last twenty-five years, and particularly in the last ten, to forestall this tragedy are deliberately played down. The legitimate needs and grievances of the Axis nations are inflated out of all relation to the facts. The extent to which the failure to right the grievances and meet the needs was due to the calculated determination of Axis warlords to use no other method and machinery save that of war is carefully side-stepped. What itemized moral difference it would make to us if we lost and the Axis won is seldom forthrightly mentioned.

Of course, to have the theologically necessary measure of penitence it is necessary to have a fair-sized feeling of guilt which, in turn, requires something of like size to be guilty of. That quantity of guilt some churchmen have undertaken to provide. But most of their materials are synthetic.

The average Christian doing, with his Christian conscience intact, what he now has to do is neither fooled nor depressed thereby. He knows that we have made mistakes. But he believes in the United States in spite of them. He does not believe merely in terms of what can be made of it. He believes in the United States for what it already has been and is. He believes that far more often than not it has been right. He believes it is right now. Not right in the absolute sense. But right enough to put it in a

different class altogether from Germany, Japan and Italy. He is willingly staking his life on that conviction. And the banners of his spirit are not sackcloth nor its diet ashes.

What shall the Christian do is, for most Christians, an already settled question. The fact that such a question still can be raised in Christian circles many months after Pearl Harbor is an indication of the remoteness of the spiritual area into which some Christians, in search of a way to reconcile their ab-

solutes with today's relatives, have been obliged to retreat.

In their retreat they have not only left the world behind them but the Church. The Church, doubtless, will miss them. But it is reassuring to know how great is the number of those within the Church who engaged in today's desperate business hold to the firm faith that their grim enterprise can be turned to Christian account. They, I think, are proving their fitness to turn it that way.

The World Church: News and Notes

German Lutheran Church Eliminates Jewish Influence

The National Consistory of the German Lutheran Church of Rumania has, on the motion of Bishop Staedel, decided that that Church as a body is to join the "Institute for Research into the Jewish Influence upon German Church Life" found in Eisenach. . . . The following statements by Bishop Staedel were accepted as guiding principles for the work as a whole:

"We are deeply convinced that at a time of national revival, we simply make it extremely difficult for a German to come to Jesus Christ if we present him with a continuous and detailed treatment of the Old Testament. In the two hours every week, which are meant to be devoted to bringing the message of the Saviour to the German in his national and community, we have simply no room for the national and messianic history of the Israelite-Jewish people. And so we advocate the elimination of the Old Testament so far as possible from the religious life of the Germans, and therefore from Lutheran religious instructions."

I. C. P. I. S. Geneva.

Quisling's New Bishops Issue a Seven Point Appeal

A further indication of the present abject position of the Nazis in relation to the church conflict was provided by a 7-point "appeal" sent out by the new Quisling-appointed bishops.

Following is the text of the Quisling bishops' appeal as broadcast by Oslo Radio on July 1st and heard in the United States:

"First, the Bible and our religious beliefs confirm that anyone opposing the authorities opposes the Order of God. In the Epistle to the Romans, 13th chapter, authorities are defined as being anyone with governing powers over a country which has been given to them by the grace of God.

"Secondly, there are the examples of Jesus and the apostles. Jesus and the apostles obeyed the heathen authorities of their time. As for the present government of Norway, it has continuously stated that it is on the side of Christianity and the Norwegian Church. This ought

to be sufficient reason for us to support it unanimously in our fight for the country and the people.

"Thirdly, there is the limit to our obedience toward the authorities. The only written exception to obedience to authorities is found in the Book of Revelations, in chapters 4 to 18, and 15 to 29 [references apparently confused]. If the authorities refuse to allow the preaching of the Gospel, thereby, attacking the life of Jesus and His work, it is our Christian duty to obey God and not the people. A case like that of this chapter has not occurred while the present government has been in power.

"The fourth point is the real cause of the Church strike. We have realized that some of our clergy oppose the present government for political reasons. They have, among other things, refused to publish banns of marriage, to marry people, to answer the official correspondence, and so on. The clergy who are on strike are allowing themselves to be used as tools in an attack on the new government.

"Fifth, there is the boycott of the loyal clergymen [here this refers to pro-Nazi pastors]. When sections of congregations in certain parts of the country boycotted the clergy, they did so for political and not for religious reasons. The clergy who are being boycotted preach the same Gospel as the clergy who are on strike, and they have the same religious foundations.

"Sixth, there is the godless movement. This movement, which is to be found in all countries and within all political parties, cannot be blamed on the National Socialist government. The godless movement in this country is the fruit of the sins of the earlier generations.

"Seventh, there is reconciliation. The present split within our country's Christian population is a sin against the Holy Brotherhood and a tragedy for our Church and our people. In accordance with Jesus, Who told us to love each other and Who gave His life for us, we stretch out our hands in reconciliation and peace for the benefit of our country and people."

This appeal was signed by the following Quisling-named bishops: Froyland, Daae Zwigmeyer, H. I. B. Kvasnes, Einar Lothe, K. H. Hagen, Dagfinn Zwigmeyer, E. G. Kristian, Falsh-Hansen and E. B. Syvertsen.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, <i>Chairman</i>	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
JOHN C. BENNETT	FRANCIS P. MILLER
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	EDWARD L. PARSONS
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
JOHN A. MACKAY	DOROTHY CLEMENS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>

A New Orthodox Metropolitan

The Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church in emigration has just created a new post of Metropolitan for Central Europe. Archbishop Seraphim of Berlin has been appointed to this office. The German Minister for Church Affairs has confirmed the decision and the nomination. At the same time, the Synod nominated, in agreement with the German Ministry for Church Affairs, a vicar for the new Metropolitan in the person of Archimandrite Philip (Gardner), who will now be entitled Bishop of Potsdam. His installation took place on June 24th in the Orthodox Cathedral at Berlin.

I. C. P. I. S. Geneva

Work for Prisoners of War Going Forward in Four Countries

A report from the New York office of the War Prisoners' Aid of the Y. M. C. A. indicates that their work is going forward most satisfactorily and specifically states that word has been received from the governments of four countries as follows:

Japan—The work for prisoners of war is well launched.

China—Permission has been given to organize war prisoners and internee aid under the Geneva Convention.

Canada—One secretary is giving full time to organizing a program of activities for interned Japanese.

United States—Permission has been granted for carrying on work for Japanese and other nationals interned.

The Commission on Aliens and Prisoners of War of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is providing service to Japanese evacuees in assembly and re-location centers.

I. C. P. I. S. New York

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 1-43

British Leader on Russia

In an editorial in *The Baptist Times* (London) Doctor J. H. Rushbrooke, president of the Baptist World Alliance, writes as follows about Russia:

" . . . Say what we will of its 'ideology,' the Russian Revolution has broken a tyranny every whit as evil as that which the French Revolution shattered, and has opened a wider life to many hundreds of thousands. Nor, despite the relentless severity of its dealings with so-called counter-revolutionaries, can we deny that the Soviet Government has held to its declared purpose of ensuring for the masses a real partnership in the wealth of the community. It is indeed a heavy misfortune that unhappy and shocking incidents have often diverted attention from a unique social experiment which means so much for the world. Our quarrel as Christians is not with a Socialist ideal, but with a doctrine of class hatred, a ruthless use of physical force, and a materialistic and therefore an inadequate estimate of human value. Nevertheless, when the last word has been said on such matters, the broad statement is justified that, as compared with twenty years ago, Soviet Russia registers on balance a moral advance, as certainly as Nazi Germany in a like comparison registers a moral set-back.

" . . . Let us make all just allowance. The old State Church was closely bound up with the Czarist regime; it stood as a foe of democratic claims; it was drenched in superstitious ideas which antagonised the thoughtful; its relics and its incredible legends of saints have furnished superabundant material for numerous 'anti-God' museums and lectures. Only slowly can it be understood that the exposure of superstition and of the reactionary attitude of Churchmen is not a refutation of religion but a valuable service to intelligent faith. . . ."

The National Synod at Valence

The National Synod of the Reformed Church of France met at Valence-sur-Rhône from April 21 to 23, 1942. Besides many pastors from the unoccupied zone, a dozen pastors from the occupied zone were able to attend.

Pastor Boegner, President of the National Council, expressed his emotion at seeing the new faces of his friends from the occupied zone, and the suffering he felt when he thought that misunderstandings might little by little arise between the brethren in the two zones. "We wish," he declared, "to prepare ourselves in prayer and love for the task which will belong to our whole Church when the integrity and true independence of our country have been restored." Pastor Rohr, President of the National Council for the occupied zone, strongly expressed the desire of the Churches there to keep alive the sense of the absolute solidarity of the whole Reformed Church of France.

I. C. P. I. S. Geneva

Authors in This Issue

Mr. Stanley High is one of the Roving Editors for the Reader's Digest.

Doctor Justin Wroe Nixon is Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics at The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.